

REMARKS

Claims 2-3 and 5-11 are now pending in the application. Claims 2-3, 5-9, and 11 are amended herein. Claims 1 and 12-13 are cancelled herein. The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejections in view of the amendments and remarks contained herein.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1-6 and 8-13 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Kragl (PCT No. WO 02/054129 A1, Publication Date 07/11/2002).

Claims 1 and 12-13 are cancelled herein. Claim 4 was previously cancelled. Accordingly, Applicants submit that this rejection is moot with regard to claims 1, 4, and 12-13.

As now presented, claims 2, 5-6, and 8-11 depend on claim 7. As explained herein, claim 7 has been rewritten in independent form and, therefore, should be in condition for allowance. Accordingly, for at least the same reasons, Applicants submit that claims 2, 5-6, and 8-11 should also be patentable.

As now presented, claim 3 calls for a manufacturing method of an optical communication module wherein providing a double-ended tapered through-hole includes: "...irradiating the substrate with a femto-second pulse laser while relatively moving the femto-second pulse laser in an axial direction of the double-ended tapered through-hole; and removing a region of the substrate changed by the irradiation of the femto-second pulse laser so that the double-ended tapered through-hole emerges." The Examiner has indicated that similar subject matter is allowable with regard to the

formation of a tapered through-hole (see page 3 of the Office Action). According to the principles of the present disclosure, a double-ended tapered through-hole can be formed by employing a femto-second pulse laser and similar process steps as described with regard to a tapered through-hole, while changing the irradiation conditions (see, e.g., paragraph [0112] of the present application). Accordingly, for at least these reasons, Applicants submit that claim 3 is not anticipated by Kragl and should be patentable.

Applicants, therefore, respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection.

ALLOWABLE SUBJECT MATTER

The Examiner states that claim 7 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form. Accordingly, Applicants have amended claim 7 to include the subject matter of claim 1. Therefore, claim 7 should now be in condition for allowance.

CONCLUSION

It is believed that all of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all presently outstanding rejections. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action and the present application is in condition for allowance. Thus, prompt and favorable consideration of this amendment is respectfully requested. If the Examiner

believes that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at (248) 641-1600.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: November 8, 2006

By: 

G. Gregory Schivley

Reg. No. 27,382

Bryant E. Wade

Reg. No. 40,344

HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.
P.O. Box 828
Bloomfield Hills, Michigan 48303
(248) 641-1600

GGG/BEW/DWH/sms